

UR 1275

ER-40685-727

FEYNMAN PARAMETRIZATION AND THE DEGENERATE ELECTRON GAS

Paulo F. Bedaque

and

Ashok Das

*Department of Physics and Astronomy**University of Rochester**Rochester, NY 14627, USA*

Abstract

We give an alternate derivation of Weldon's formula for combining products of factors with non identical analytic behavior. While such a formula would appear to be useful in finite temperature calculations, we give an example of a zero temperature calculation, namely, the degenerate electron gas, to justify the result.

I. Introduction

The question of analyticity in finite temperature Green's functions has led to some disagreement between imaginary time and real time calculations in the recent years. To be specific, the real part of the self-energy of a scalar theory was shown [1], in the imaginary time formalism [2], to have a non analytic behaviour at vanishing external momentum, namely, at $p^\mu = 0$. A modification of the imaginary time calculation was proposed in [3] which used Feynman parametrization and led to a self-energy which is analytic at $p^\mu \rightarrow 0$. The real time [4] calculation of the self-energy was carried out with a limiting procedure [5] leading to a result which coincided with that of ref. [1] whereas a calculation done with ϵ -regularization [6] led to a self-energy which is analytic at $p^\mu = 0$. It is worth pointing out here that the real time calculation in ref. [6] used the naive Feynman parametrization formula in combining products of factors. The disagreement between these various calculations was recently resolved by Weldon [7] who showed that in combining factors of opposite analytic behavior, the naive Feynman parametrization needs to be modified. At finite temperature the factors one needs to combine often have opposite analytic behavior and with the modification of the combination formula, Weldon showed that all calculations agree.

In a separate development, we have been interested in studying the degenerate electron gas, for which many results are known at zero temperature [8,9], using the ϵ -regularization. Our primary interest in this system arose mainly because the real part of the self-energy in this system also shows a nonanalytic behavior at $p^\mu = 0$ even at zero temperature. Surprisingly enough our calculation using the ϵ -regularization disagreed with the standard classical value. The ϵ -regularization, therefore, appeared suspect. However, as we will show shortly, the ϵ -regularization itself is well behaved. But this is one of the few cases at zero temperature where the Feynman formula needs to be modified according to Weldon's formula. The plan of the paper is as follows. In sec. II, we give an alternate derivation

of Weldon's formula in a more general form. In sec. III, we calculate the real part of the self-energy of a degenerate electron gas at zero temperature by integrating out the δ -function directly. In sec. IV, we calculate the same quantity using the ϵ -regularization but without using Feynman parametrization and show that the two results are the same. In sec. V the same calculation is carried out using the ϵ -regularization but with the naive Feynman parametrization formula. The result in this case is different from the earlier ones showing that the combination formula is the real culprit. In sec. VI, we use the modified combination formula to show that the result agrees with the earlier calculations. Finally, we present our conclusions in sec. VII and comment on attempts to modify Feynman rules at finite temperature.

II. Alternate Derivation of Weldon's Formula

Let us consider the integral

$$\begin{aligned} I &= P \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{[x(A + i\alpha\epsilon) + (1-x)(B + i\beta\epsilon)]^2} \\ &= P \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{[x(A - B + i\epsilon(\alpha - \beta)) + B + i\beta\epsilon]^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where A, B, α, β and ϵ are assumed to be real. Furthermore, we assume that $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ and that α, β have unit magnitude (i.e., $\alpha = \pm 1, \beta = \pm 1$).

If there are no poles of the integrand on the real x -axis between $(0, 1)$ then we identify

$$\begin{aligned} I &= P \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{[x(A - B + i\epsilon(\alpha - \beta)) + B + i\beta\epsilon]^2} \\ &= \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{[x(A - B + i\epsilon(\alpha - \beta)) + B + i\beta\epsilon]^2} \\ &= - \frac{1}{A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon} \frac{1}{x(A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon + B + i\beta\epsilon)} \Big|_0^1 \\ &= \frac{1}{A + i\alpha\epsilon} - \frac{1}{B + i\beta\epsilon}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

This is, of course, the naive Feynman parametrization formula and we note that since α and β can always be rescaled, we have lost no generality in choosing their magnitudes to be unity.

If, on the other hand, the integrand has poles on the real x -axis between $(0, 1)$, then we have to regularize the integrand by taking its principal value. Note that the integrand will have a pole at $x = x_0$ on the real axis if

$$x_0(A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon) + B + i\beta\epsilon = 0 \quad (3)$$

$$\text{or, } x_0(A - B) + B = -i(\beta + x_0(\alpha - \beta))\epsilon = 0. \quad (4)$$

The solution to these equations are

$$x_0 = \frac{\beta}{\beta - \alpha} \quad (5)$$

$$\beta A = \alpha B. \quad (6)$$

It is clear now from Eq. (5) that $0 \leq x_0 \leq 1$ only when α and β have opposite sign (if $\alpha = 1, \beta = -1$, then $x_0 = \frac{1}{2}$ but we will leave α, β arbitrary at this point).

Assuming that $0 \leq x_0 = \frac{\beta}{\beta - \alpha} \leq 1$, we can evaluate the integral in Eq. (1) as

$$\begin{aligned} I &= \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \left[\int_0^{\frac{\beta}{\beta - \alpha} - \eta} \frac{dx}{[x(A - B + i\epsilon(\alpha - \beta)) + B + i\beta\epsilon]^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \int_{\frac{\beta}{\beta - \alpha} + \eta}^1 \frac{dx}{[x(A - B + i\epsilon(\alpha - \beta)) + B + i\beta\epsilon]^2} \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \left[- \frac{1}{x(A - B + i\epsilon(\alpha - \beta)) + B + i\beta\epsilon} \Big|_0^{\frac{\beta}{\beta - \alpha} - \eta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{x(A - B + i\epsilon(\alpha - \beta)) + B + i\beta\epsilon} \Big|_{\frac{\beta}{\beta - \alpha} + \eta}^1 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon} \left(\frac{1}{B + i\beta\epsilon} - \frac{1}{A + i\alpha\epsilon} \right) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon} \lim_{\eta \rightarrow 0^+} \left[\frac{\beta - \alpha}{\beta A - \alpha B + i\eta\epsilon} - \frac{\beta - \alpha}{\beta A - \alpha B - i\eta\epsilon} \right] \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{A + i\alpha\epsilon} \frac{1}{B + i\beta\epsilon} \\
&\quad - \frac{\beta - \alpha}{A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon} \left[P \frac{1}{\beta A - \alpha B} - i\pi\delta(\beta A - \alpha B) - P \frac{1}{\beta A - \alpha B} - i\pi\delta(\beta A - \alpha B) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{A + i\alpha\epsilon} \frac{1}{B + i\beta\epsilon} - 2\pi i \frac{(\alpha - \beta)\delta(\beta A - \alpha B)}{A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon}.
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Comparing Eqs. (2) and (7) we note that for any value of α and β (with unit magnitude), we can write

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{A + i\alpha\epsilon} \frac{1}{B + i\beta\epsilon} &= I + 2\pi i \frac{(\alpha - \beta)\delta(\beta A - \alpha B)}{A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon} \\
&= P \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{[x(A + i\alpha\epsilon) + (1 - x)(B + i\beta\epsilon)]^2} + 2\pi i \frac{(\alpha - \beta)\delta(\beta A - \alpha B)}{A - B + i(\alpha - \beta)\epsilon}
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

This clearly reduces to Weldon's formula (Eq. (18) in ref. [7]) when $\alpha = 1$ and $\beta = -1$. This is the modified Feynman parametrization formula.

III. Degenerate Electron Gas (Standard Results):

Let us consider a nonrelativistic, degenerate electron gas at $T = 0$ and $\mu \neq 0$ [8,9] where the chemical potential μ can be identified with the Fermi energy. In this case, the propagator has the form

$$\begin{aligned}
S(p) &= \frac{i}{p_0 - \omega_p + \mu + i\epsilon \operatorname{sgn}(\omega_p - \mu)} \\
&= \frac{i}{p_0 - \omega_p + \mu + i\epsilon \operatorname{sgn}(p_0)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

with $\omega_p = \frac{p^2}{2m}$. We would like to emphasize here that while the two forms of the propagator in Eq. (9) are equivalent, it is the second form that is easier to use in practical calculations. We would also like to note here that the propagator in this case does not have a unique analytic behaviour in the sense that the location of the singularity depends on the sign of p_0 . This is quite reminiscent of the non unique analytic behavior of propagators at finite temperature even though the system under study is at $T = 0$.

We can calculate the real part of the self-energy in a standar manner.

$$\begin{aligned}
Re \pi(p) &= Re \left[-i \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} S(k) S(k-p) \right] \\
&= Re \left[-i \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \left(\frac{i}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon \operatorname{sgn}(k_0)} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. \times \left(\frac{i}{k_0 - p_0 - \omega_{k-p} + \mu + i\epsilon \operatorname{sgn}(k_0 - p_0)} \right) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[P \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu} \operatorname{sgn}(k_0 - p_0) \delta(k_0 - p_0 - \omega_{k-p} + \mu) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + P \frac{1}{k_0 - p_0 - \omega_{k-p} + \mu} \operatorname{sgn}(k_0) \delta(k_0 - \omega_k + \mu) \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[P \frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu} + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \operatorname{sgn}(k_0) \delta(k_0 - \omega_k + \mu). \quad (10)
\end{aligned}$$

Here we have let $k_\mu \rightarrow k_\mu + p_\mu$ in the first term of the integrand to arrive at the form in the last step. We have also used the standard result

$$\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{x + i\alpha\epsilon} = P \frac{1}{x} - i\pi \operatorname{sgn}(\alpha) \delta(x). \quad (11)$$

We can do the k_0 integration in Eq. (10) directly using the delta function to obtain

$$Re \pi(p) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[P \frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \operatorname{sgn}(\omega_k - \mu). \quad (12)$$

This is the standard result and can be rewritten in a straightforward manner to agree with the form of the result in ref. [9].

IV. ϵ -Regularization (Without Feynman Parametrization):

Let us next use the ϵ -regularization, namely,

$$P \frac{1}{x} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{x}{x^2 + \epsilon^2} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{1}{x + i\epsilon} + \frac{1}{x - i\epsilon} \right) \quad (13)$$

$$\delta(x) = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{1}{\pi} \frac{\epsilon}{x^2 + \epsilon^2} = \lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+} \frac{i}{2\pi} \left(\frac{1}{x + i\epsilon} - \frac{1}{x - i\epsilon} \right) \quad (14)$$

In this case, the relation in Eq. (10) can be written as (From now on we will not explicitly write $\epsilon \rightarrow 0^+$ although this should be understood.)

$$\begin{aligned}
Re \pi(p) &= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \left[\frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu + i\epsilon} + \frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu - i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \text{sgn}(k_0) \left(\frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon} - \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon} \right) \\
&= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \text{sgn}(k_0) \left[\frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu - i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu - i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon} \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= I_1 + I_2, \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

where we have separated the integral into two terms. I_1 contains products of terms with similar analytic behavior while the factors in I_2 have opposite analytic behavior. We note that

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \text{sgn}(k_0) \left[\frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu - i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon} \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \int_0^\infty dk_0 \left[\frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{k_0 - p_0 + \omega_{k+p} - \mu - i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 + \omega_k - \mu - i\epsilon} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu - i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{k_0 - p_0 + \omega_{k+p} - \mu + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 + \omega_k - \mu + i\epsilon} \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right]. \tag{16}
\end{aligned}$$

This can be evaluated with the method of the residues using a contour in the upper right quadrant and the result is

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} 2\pi i \left[-\frac{\theta(\mu + p_0 - \omega_{k+p})}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} - \frac{\theta(\mu - \omega_k)}{\omega_{k+p} - p_0 - \omega_k} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{\theta(-\mu - p_0 + \omega_{k+p})}{\omega_{k+p} - p_0 - \omega_k} - \frac{\theta(-\mu + \omega_k)}{\omega_k - \omega_{k+p} + p_0} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} (\text{sgn}(\omega_k - \mu) - \text{sgn}(\omega_{k+p} - p_0 - \mu)) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right]. \tag{17}
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, we can calculate

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \text{sgn}(k_0) \left[\frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu - i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \int_0^\infty dk_0 \left[\frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu - i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{k_0 - p_0 + \omega_{k+p} - \mu + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 + \omega_k - \mu - i\epsilon} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{k_0 + p_0 - \omega_{k+p} + \mu + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 - \omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon} \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{1}{k_0 - p_0 + \omega_{k+p} - \mu - i\epsilon} \frac{1}{k_0 + \omega_k - \mu + i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \tag{18}
\end{aligned}$$

which, by the method of residues has the value

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} 2\pi i \left[\frac{\theta(-\mu - p_0 + \omega_{k+p})}{\omega_{k+p} - p_0 - \omega_k + 2i\epsilon} - \frac{\theta(\mu - \omega_k)}{\omega_{k+p} - p_0 - \omega_k + 2i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{\theta(\mu + p_0 - \omega_{k+p})}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p} + 2i\epsilon} - \frac{\theta(\omega_k - \mu)}{\omega_k - \omega_{k+p} + p_0 + 2i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right]. \tag{19}
\end{aligned}$$

Using Eq. (11) we can simplify this to

$$I_2 = \frac{1}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} (\text{sgn}(\omega_k - \mu) + \text{sgn}(\omega_{k+p} - p_0 - \mu)) + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right]. \quad (20)$$

Adding the two contributions in Eqs. (17) and (20), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Re}\pi(p) &= I_1 + I_2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \text{sgn}(\omega_k - \mu). \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

This is, of course, the same result as in Eq. (12) obtained by a direct calculation using the δ function. This calculation shows that the ϵ -regularization is well defined and is free from any difficulty.

V. ϵ -Regularization (With naive Feynman Parametrization):

If we naively use the Feynman parametrization

$$\frac{1}{A + i\alpha\epsilon} \frac{1}{B + i\beta\epsilon} = \int_0^1 \frac{dx}{[x(A + i\alpha\epsilon) + (1-x)(B + i\beta\epsilon)]^2} \quad (22)$$

then we can write (see Eq. (16))

$$\begin{aligned} I_1 &= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \int_0^\infty dk_0 \int_0^1 dx \left[\frac{1}{[k_0 + x(p_0 - \omega_{k+p}) - (1-x)\omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon]^2} \right. \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{[k_0 - x(p_0 - \omega_{k+p}) + (1-x)\omega_k - \mu - i\epsilon]^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{[k_0 + x(p_0 - \omega_{k+p}) - (1-x)\omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon]^2} \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{[k_0 - x(p_0 - \omega_{k+p}) + (1-x)\omega_k - \mu + i\epsilon]^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\ &= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \int_0^1 dx \left[\frac{1}{x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon} \right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{1}{x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu + i\epsilon} \\
& - \frac{1}{x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon} \\
& - \frac{1}{x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu - i\epsilon} \\
& + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \Big] \tag{23}
\end{aligned}$$

This can be simplified using Eq. (11) to obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_1 &= \frac{i}{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \int_0^1 dx \left[-2\pi i \delta(x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu) + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\int_{-\omega_k + \mu}^{p_0 + \mu - \omega_{k+p}} ds \frac{\delta(s)}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} (\text{sgn}(\omega_k - \mu) - \text{sgn}(\omega_{k+p} - p_0 - \mu)) + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \tag{24}
\end{aligned}$$

We see that this is exactly the same as Eq. (17) which shows that the naive Feynman parametrization holds for factors with similar analytic behavior.

Using Eq. (18), we can calculate I_2 and it has the form

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 &= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \int_0^\infty dk_0 \int_0^1 dx \left[\frac{1}{[k_0 + x(p_0 - \omega_{k+p}) - (1-x)\omega_k + \mu + i(1-2x)\epsilon]^2} \right. \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{[k_0 - x(p_0 - \omega_{k+p}) + (1-x)\omega_k - \mu - i(1-2x)\epsilon]^2} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{[k_0 + x(p_0 - \omega_{k+p}) - (1-x)\omega_k + \mu - i(1-2x)\epsilon]^2} \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{[k_0 - x(p_0 - \omega_{k+p}) + (1-x)\omega_k - \mu + i(1-2x)\epsilon]^2} \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \int_0^1 dx \left[\frac{1}{x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu + i(1-2x)\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu + i(1-2x)\epsilon} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu - i(1-2x)\epsilon} \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \frac{1}{x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu - i(1 - 2x)\epsilon} \\
& + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu] \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^1 dx [\text{sgn}(1 - 2x) \delta(x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu) + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu] \\
& = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} dx [\delta(x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu) + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu] \right. \\
& \quad \left. - \int_{\frac{1}{2}}^1 dx [\delta(x(p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}) - \omega_k + \mu) + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu] \right]. \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

This can be evaluated as in Eq. (24) and we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 = \frac{1}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} & \left[\frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} [\text{sgn}(\omega_k - \mu) + \text{sgn}(\omega_{k+p} - p_0 - \mu) \right. \\
& \quad \left. + 2 \text{sgn}\left(\frac{p_0 - \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}}{2} + \mu\right) \right] \\
& \quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right]. \tag{26}
\end{aligned}$$

We notice that I_2 calculated with the naive Feynman parametrization differs from Eq. (20) and, therefore, it is clear that $Re \pi(p)$ which is the sum of I_1 and I_2 will be different in this case from the standard result. The reason for the discrepancy is also clear. The ϵ -regularization has no problems, however, it is the Feynman combination formula in the case of factors with opposite analytic behavior which seems to be suspect.

VI. ϵ -Regularization (Weldon's correction):

As we see from Eq. (8), Weldon's corrections apply only when we are combining factors with opposite analytic behaviour. This is, of course, the case for I_2 . Thus, with

Eq. (8) we note that I_2 will pick up an additional contribution of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{I}_2 &= \frac{i}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^4} \int_0^\infty dk_0 \left[- \frac{4\pi i \delta(2k_0 + p_0 - \omega_k - \omega_{k+p} + 2\mu)}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p} - 2i\epsilon} \right. \\
&\quad + \frac{4\pi i \delta(2k_0 - p_0 + \omega_k + \omega_{k+p} - 2\mu)}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p} - 2i\epsilon} \\
&\quad - \frac{4\pi i \delta(2k_0 + p_0 - \omega_k - \omega_{k+p} + 2\mu)}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p} + 2i\epsilon} \\
&\quad + \frac{4\pi i \delta(2k_0 - p_0 + \omega_k + \omega_{k+p} - 2\mu)}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p} + 2i\epsilon} \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^\infty dk_0 \left[\frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} \left(\delta(2k_0 + p_0 - \omega_k - \omega_{k+p} + 2\mu) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \delta(2k_0 - p_0 + \omega_k + \omega_{k+p} - 2\mu) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} \left(\theta(\omega_k + \omega_{k+p} - p_0 - 2\mu) \right. \right. \\
&\quad \left. \left. - \theta(p_0 - \omega_k - \omega_{k+p} + 2\mu) \right) + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right] \\
&= -\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} \operatorname{sgn}\left(\frac{p_0 - \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}}{2} + \mu\right) + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right]. \quad (27)
\end{aligned}$$

With this correction, then, we obtain adding Eqs. (26) and (27)

$$\begin{aligned}
I_2 + \tilde{I}_2 &= \frac{1}{4} \int \frac{d^3 k}{(2\pi)^3} \left[\frac{1}{p_0 + \omega_k - \omega_{k+p}} \left(\operatorname{sgn}(\omega_k - \mu) + \operatorname{sgn}(\omega_{k+p} - p_0 - \mu) \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + p_\mu \rightarrow -p_\mu \right]. \quad (28)
\end{aligned}$$

We recognize this to be exactly the same as Eq. (20) and it is clear that the discrepancy lies truly in the combination of factors with opposite analytic behaviour using the naive Feynman formula. The correct combination formula, first derived by Weldon [7], is given in Eq. (8) and, as is clear, is essential in problems even at zero temperature.

VII. Conclusion :

We have generalized Weldon's formula for combining products of factors and have given an alternate derivation of this. This appears to be at the heart of the disagreement about the analytic behaviour of Feynman amplitudes at finite temperature. We have tried to emphasize with an example that the modified Feynman parametrization formula is quite useful even at zero temperature. We have systematically calculated the real part of the self-energy of a nonrelativistic, degenerate electron gas at $T = 0$ by direct integration of the delta function, by the ϵ -regularization (without Feynman parametrization, with naive Feynman parametrization and with modified Feynman parametrization) and have shown that it is not the ϵ -regularization which is problematic. Rather, it is the naive Feynman parametrization which needs to be modified according to Eq. (8). In this case, all calculations (direct calculation, ϵ -regularization without Feynman parametrization as well as ϵ -regularization with modified Feynman parametrization) agree.

It is interesting to note that $Re \pi(p)$, even for the degenerate electron gas at $T = 0$, has a nonanalytic behaviour at $p^\mu = 0$ (see for example ref. [9] pg 162). The Feynman rules at $T = 0$ are, of course, fixed and cannot be changed *ad hoc*. In fact, it is evident that whenever a physical system interacts with a real background (such as the Fermi sea or the finite temperature thermal bath), there would necessarily arise such nonanalyticity. This appears to be a general and physical effect and, therefore, we believe that modifying the finite temperature Feynman rules to make the amplitude analytic is inappropriate. In fact, it would be quite interesting to study the effective action for this system at zero or finite temperature in order to get a deeper understanding of the additional Feynman rules at $T \neq 0$ [10,11].

This work was supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy Grant no. DE-FG02-91ER40685 and P. B. acknowledges partial financial support from CAPES.

References:

1. H. A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D28**, 2007 (1983).
2. T. Matsubara, Prog. Theor. Physics **14**, 351 (1955).
3. P. S. Gribosky and B. R. Holstein, Z. Phys. **C47**, 205 (1990).
4. H. Umezawa, H. Matsumoto and M. Tachiki, “Thermo Field Dynamics and Condensed States”, North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1982.
5. Y. Fujimoto and H. Yamada, Z. Phys. **C37**, 265 (1988).
6. P. F. Bedaque and A. Das, Phys. Rev. **D45**, 2906 (1992).
7. H. A. Weldon, West Virginia University Preprint WVU-992 (August, 1992).
8. A. A. Abrikosov, L. P. Gorkov and I. E. Dzyaloshinski, “Methods of Quantum Field Theory in Statistical Physics”, Dover, New York 1963.
9. A. L. Fetter and J. D. Walecka, “Quantum Theory of Many Particle Systems”, McGraw-Hill, New York 1971.
10. H. Matsumoto, Y. Nakano and H. Umezawa, Phys. Rev. **D31**, 1495 (1985).
T. S. Evans, Z. Phys. **C36**, 153 (1987).
11. R. L. Kobes, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 1269 (1991).
T. S. Evans, Nucl. Phys. **B374**, 340 (1992).